

W. Scott Randolph
Director - Regulatory Affairs



Verizon Communications
1300 I Street
Suite 500E
Washington, DC 20005

Phone: 202 515-2530
Fax: 202 336-7922
srandolph@verizon.com

July 9, 2001

Ms. Magalie R. Salas
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20554

**Ex Parte: Arbitration of Interconnection Agreements Between Verizon and AT&T,
Cox and WorldCom, CC Docket Nos. 00-218, 00-249, and 00-251**

Dear Ms. Salas:

The accompanying letter and attachments were delivered to Dorothy Attwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, and her staff today, July 9, 2001.

Pursuant to Section 1.1206(a)(1) of the Commission's rules, an original and one copy of this letter are being submitted to the Office of the Secretary. Please associate this notification with the record in the proceedings indicated above. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please call me at (202) 515-2530.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "W. Scott Randolph", written in a cursive style.

W. Scott Randolph

Attachment

cc: Dorothy Attwood

RICHARD D. GARY
PARTNER
DIRECT DIAL: 804 • 788 • 8330
EMAIL: rgary@hunton.com

July 9, 2001

FILE NO: 46001.000278

Ms. Dorothy T. Attwood, Chief
Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Streets, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

**Arbitration of Interconnection Agreements between
Verizon and AT&T, Cox and WorldCom,**
CC Document Nos. 00-218, 00-249 and 00-251

Dear Ms. Attwood:

The Commission's letter of July 2, 2001 required that the parties provide to you by today a list of any issues they deemed appropriate for discussion at tomorrow's status conference. Verizon Virginia Inc. ("Verizon Virginia") is pleased to provide the following information and proposals for discussion at the Status Conference.

You asked specifically that the parties raise any challenge to the appropriateness for arbitration of any issue listed in the Petitions for Arbitration. As you are aware, Verizon Virginia filed a Motion to Dismiss on June 27, 2001 in which it urged the dismissal, or in the alternative deferral of consideration, of issues that have been, or soon will be, resolved in other pending proceedings.¹ In addition to the issues identified in Verizon Virginia's Motion to Dismiss, a number of issues raised by WorldCom alone are not appropriate for arbitration in their present form because WorldCom has failed to meet its burden to identify and

¹ The issues that should be dismissed or deferred are as follows: Intercarrier compensation for ISP-bound traffic, combinations of unbundled network elements ("UNEs"), conversion of service to UNEs, switching unbundling obligations when used to serve 4 or more lines in the largest 50 metropolitan statistical areas, line sharing and line splitting, collocation of advance services equipment and performance metrics. The specific issues are listed on Attachment A.

Ms. Dorothy T. Attwood, Chief
July 9, 2001
Page 2

articulate the particular substantive issue in dispute.² Verizon Virginia raised this same concern earlier in its Opposition to WorldCom's statement of disputed issues in its Petition filed on October 26, 2000, and the FCC indicated that WorldCom's statement of those issues was adequate given the limited discussion between the parties up to that point. When WorldCom filed its arbitration petition with this Commission, however, it expanded its list to more than 100 issues and still failed to identify the alleged disputes so as to give Verizon Virginia an opportunity to respond. Although Verizon Virginia has agreed to settle many of those issues, WorldCom has completely rebuffed Verizon's attempts to clarify the substantive disputes that remain. When Verizon sought to ascertain the disputed issues in discovery, WorldCom responded that identification of substantive disputes was, even as late as last week, "premature."³ WorldCom stated outright that it would finally reveal its arguments only "in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001."⁴

WorldCom's tactic clearly prejudices Verizon, leaving it with the impossible task of preparing a case on unknown issues. Verizon *still* does not know what substantive issues WorldCom believes it has raised. In most cases, WorldCom simply asks whether a topic should be addressed in the interconnection agreement and then proposes (often pages of) particular language, without providing either the Commission or Verizon notice as to the nature or substance of the alleged underlying dispute. As the case now stands, Verizon's first opportunity to learn what issues are in dispute will be WorldCom's direct testimony. Verizon thus is unable to prepare its own case on those issues in its direct testimony. Verizon's *only* opportunity to present testimony or other evidence as to these issues will be on rebuttal.

In addition to issues for which WorldCom has failed to identify the actual dispute, WorldCom raises a number of issues that Verizon has already settled with AT&T and for which Verizon

² These issues are identified in Attachment A.

³ See, e.g., *Responses of WorldCom, Inc. to Verizon Virginia Inc.'s First Set of Data Requests* at 2 through 28, CC Docket Nos. 00-218, 00-249, 00-251 (FCC filed July 2, 2001) ("WorldCom Objections to Data Requests") (Attachment B).

⁴ *Id.* WorldCom has since filed responses to these discovery requests that, in some cases, identify one or two specific sub-issues, but that still fail to provide anything approaching a comprehensive list of the specific disputes WorldCom is asking the Commission to decide.

Ms. Dorothy T. Attwood, Chief
July 9, 2001
Page 3

has offered to agree to the same language with WorldCom.⁵ Verizon has provided the AT&T-Verizon language to WorldCom, but WorldCom has refused to consider it even though it previously indicated its willingness to do so.⁶ In fact, Verizon has directly asked WorldCom to explain why it rejects language that satisfied AT&T, and WorldCom has failed to respond.⁷ Even in those rare instances where WorldCom has addressed the AT&T-accepted language at all, it has refused to provide more than a sentence or two of explanation, leaving Verizon to guess at the substance of WorldCom's objection.

In light of WorldCom's failure to articulate its substantive disputes on numerous issues and its refusal, without explanation, to accept language that satisfied AT&T on others, these issues (listed in Attachment A) should be dismissed from this arbitration. In the alternative, these issues should be placed on a separate track and not included in the direct testimony due next week. Instead, WorldCom should first be required to state the disputed issues with particularity, and, where applicable, to explain why the AT&T-accepted language is not satisfactory. WorldCom and Verizon should then be given time to negotiate with respect to those issues, and either resolve many or at least narrow them. Any remaining disputes can be arbitrated subsequently in a separate proceeding. At this stage, however, they are simply not ripe for resolution by the Commission.

In no circumstances should the Commission simply adopt WorldCom's proposed language without requiring WorldCom to first articulate the issues in dispute and giving Verizon the opportunity to respond to WorldCom's arguments with direct testimony.

In addition, with respect to several of the specific categories identified in your July 2, 2001 letter, Verizon Virginia has several additional suggestions for the efficient resolution of these arbitrations:

⁵ The specific issues falling into this category are listed in Attachment A.

⁶ See *WorldCom Request for Arbitration* at 8 n.5, CC Docket No. 00-218 (April 23, 2001).

⁷ See, e.g., WorldCom Objections to Data Requests, Interrogatories 13, 39, 40, 43, 45, 46, 47 and 51.

Ms. Dorothy T. Attwood, Chief
July 9, 2001
Page 4

A. Simplifying or narrowing the issues.

In addition to granting Verizon Virginia's Motions, Verizon Virginia recently has proposed to the parties that the issues that are not premised on factual disputes, but rather involve legal or policy issues, need only be briefed by the parties, and do not require the filing of testimony. These issues are listed on Attachment A. The Petitioners have not yet responded to Verizon's proposal. At tomorrow's Status Conference, the parties should agree on this list, or agree on what facts any party believes are in dispute. The direct testimony of the Petitioners to be filed on July 19 may reveal additional issues where no factual dispute exists. If so, Verizon Virginia will propose that those issues also need only be briefed by the parties and not addressed at the hearings.

B. Obtaining admissions of fact or stipulations between the parties as to any or all of the matters in controversy.

Verizon continues to discuss open issues with AT&T and WorldCom in national negotiations. It is difficult to predict if additional issues will be "closed" prior to the close of the record in these arbitrations.

C. Settlement of some or all the unresolved issues by agreement of the parties.

Verizon Virginia has agreed to settle 66 business process and general terms and conditions issues, all of which were raised only by WorldCom (except for one issue (I-4) raised by all three Petitioners) by generally accepting the language proposed by WorldCom. The list of settled issues is on Attachment A. There are other issues that Verizon offered to settle on the basis of WorldCom's proposed language with very minor modifications,⁸ and WorldCom has not yet accepted or provided a rationale for rejecting those minor changes. Verizon Virginia is hopeful that WorldCom will revisit these issues and accept Verizon Virginia's proposals.

⁸ Issues for which Verizon Virginia has essentially accepted WorldCom's language: Issues IV-88 (assignments and delegations), IV-95 (responsibility for costs and expenses), IV-97 (confidential information), IV-98 (sharing confidential information), IV-113 (negotiations prompted by change in laws), and IV-116 (submission of agreements for approval-appeals).

Ms. Dorothy T. Attwood, Chief
July 9, 2001
Page 5

D./E. Discovery procedures and schedule. The Schedule for the remainder of the case and dates for any further status conferences.

These two items are related. Verizon proposes that surrebuttal testimony be allowed with respect to the cost issues only. The parties will file direct testimony in support of their cost models on July 19 and rebuttal testimony on August 9. The rebuttal testimony will be the first opportunity for all parties to criticize the opposing cost model. Without surrebuttal testimony, the parties will be unable to respond prior to the hearing to any concerns raised about their respective cost models. The hearing process will benefit by surrebuttal testimony focused on responding to the criticism of each model raised in rebuttal. Verizon Virginia proposes that surrebuttal testimony limited to the cost issues be filed on August 30, which will allow sufficient time for review prior to the hearing that begins on September 10.

To facilitate surrebuttal testimony preparation, Verizon Virginia also requests that the discovery deadline for cost issues raised in rebuttal testimony be extended until August 13. A compressed response deadline should be established so that all responses will be due no later than August 20. This will allow the parties limited time to propound discovery related to the rebuttal cost testimony that will be filed on August 9; an accelerated response deadline of August 20 will permit the parties to incorporate discovery responses into the surrebuttal testimony. In summary, Verizon Virginia proposes the following modification to the schedule:

Deadline for cost-related discovery	August 13
Deadline for responses to cost-related discovery	August 20
File Surrebuttal Testimony on Cost Issues	August 30

The Commission should establish two additional dates for pre-hearing status conferences so that the dates can be reserved by all the parties. Verizon Virginia proposes Monday July 30 and Monday August 20. A pre-hearing status conference is already scheduled for September 6, 2001.

Looking ahead to the hearing, Verizon Virginia recommends that the Commission formalize that panels of witnesses will be appropriate for the efficient presentation of the contested factual issues. Verizon Virginia proposes panels on the following subjects to be presented in this order:

1. Network Architecture

Ms. Dorothy T. Attwood, Chief
July 9, 2001
Page 6

2. Intercarrier Compensation
3. UNE Issues
4. Line Sharing/Line Splitting
5. Rights-of-Way
6. Pricing Terms and Conditions
7. Resale
8. Security Requirements; Business Process
9. General Terms and Conditions
10. UNE Pricing
11. Non-recurring Costs

These panels will be populated by Verizon Virginia witnesses identified in its Response filed on May 31, 2001, as that list may be modified in its direct testimony to be filed on July 19. The UNE pricing and non-recurring cost panels likely will be subdivided into several panels.

Verizon Virginia appreciates the opportunity to share these suggestions and looks forward to attending tomorrow's status conference.

Sincerely,

Richard D. Gary

RDG/tms
Attachments

cc: Katherine D. Farroba
Jeffrey Dygert
Tom Priess
John Stanley
Scott Randolph
Lisa B. Smith
Robert Quinn
Alexandra Wilson
Donald L. Crosby
Kimberly Wild
Mark Keffer

ATTACHMENT A

Issues That Should be Dismissed as Resolved in or Pending in Other Proceedings (Motion to Dismiss Filed on June 27, 2001)

Intercarrier Compensation for ISP-Bound Traffic

Issue I-5

UNE Combinations

Issue III-6

Conversion of Services to UNEs

Issue III-7

Switching UNEs

Issue III-9

Line Sharing and Line Splitting

Issues III-11 and V-6

Collocation of Advanced Services Equipment

Issue IV-28

Performance Standards, Measurements and Remedies

Issues III-14 and IV-130

Issues That Are Not Ripe for Determination

Network Architecture

Issues IV-3 through IV-13 (except for settled Issue IV-9)

UNEs

Issues IV-14 through IV-27

Pricing Terms and Conditions

Issues IV-30 through IV-37

Resale

Issues IV-38 through IV-42

Security Requirements

Issues IV-43, IV-44, IV-46

Business Process

Issues IV-47 through IV-82 (except for settled Issues IV-48, 49, 51 through 55, 57, 58, 60 through 63, 66 through 73, 75 through 78)

General Terms and Conditions

Issues IV-45 through IV-129 (except for settled Issues IV-87, 89 through 90, 96, 99, 102 through 105, 108 through 109, 111 through 112, 114 through 115, 117 through 118, 122 through 125, 127 through 128)

Issues Settled With AT&T For Which WorldCom Should Accept Language Agreeable to AT&T

Issue I-10 (Termination); Issue IV-91 (Branding); Issue IV-93 (Identification of Employees On Premises Visits--Marketing Materials); Issue IV-100 (Dispute Resolution); Issue IV-101 (Binding Arbitration); Issue IV-106 (Indemnification); Issue IV-110 (Migration of Service)

Legal and Policy Issues Proposed To Be Briefed Only**Pricing Terms and Conditions**

Issues III-18 and IV-30

Security Requirements

Issues IV-43, IV-44 and IV-46

General Terms and Conditions

Issues I-10, III-15, IV-45, IV-83 through IV-129 (to the extent not already settled), V-11, VI-1 (N-X) and VII-16 through VII-22

Miscellaneous

Issue V-15

Issues Settled Between Verizon Virginia and WorldCom

IV-9 (signaling protocol)
IV-48 (escalation and work center interface procedures)
IV-49 (notification of changes to retail service)
IV-50 (essential services and deaf and disabled services)
IV-51 (application-to-application OSS interfaces – compliance)
IV-52 (change management and control procedures)
IV-53 (preordering, ordering, and provisioning order business support)
IV-54 (help desk/single point of contact)
IV-55 (preordering, ordering, and provisioning order types)

IV-57 (single order – local, intraLATA, interLATA service per OBF guidelines)
IV-58 (number administration and number reservations)
IV-60 (blocking services)
IV-61 (compliance w/OBF guidelines and processes)
IV-62 (premature disconnects)
IV-63 (coordinate cutovers)
IV-66 (firm order confirmations)
IV-67 (order rejections)
IV-68 (service order changes)
IV-69 (order completion)
IV-70 (loss notification, provisioning and billing completion notices)
IV-71 (ordering network elements)
IV-72 (application-to-application OSS interfaces)
IV-73 (ordering and provisioning for resale services and network elements)
IV-75 (access charges under interim number portability)
IV-76 (billing format)
IV-77 (recorded usage data)
IV-78 (repair, maintenance, testing and surveillance)
IV-82 (directory assistance and listings service -- resolved but for language re:
indemnification and limitation of liability)
IV-83 (scope of the agreement)
IV-86 (use of services)
IV-87 (nonwaiver)
IV-89 (audits)
IV-90 (billing disputes)
IV-92 (branding -- service marks, trademarks, etc.)
IV-96 (compliance with applicable law)
IV-99 (rules of construction)
IV-102 (entire agreement)
IV-103 (environmental contamination)
IV-104 (good faith cooperation)
IV-105 (choice of law)
IV-108 (use of logo, trademark, or service mark)
IV-109 (joint work product)
IV-111 (notice of network changes)
IV-112 (regulatory approval)
IV-114 (requesting new services)
IV-115 (submission of agreement for approval)
IV-117 (costs for obtaining rights and privileges)
IV-118 (relationship to parties)
IV-122 (severability)
IV-123 (subcontracting)
IV-124 (subcontracting and use of affiliates)
IV-125 (successors and assigns)
IV-127 (third party beneficiaries)
IV-128 (fail waiver)

VI-1(F) (customer not ready work activity)
VI-1(H) (maintenance of UNEs)
VI-1(K) (regulatory review of prices)
VI-1(M) (operations matters)
VI-1(Z) (dialing parity)
VI-1(BB) (telephone numbers)
VI-2 (A) (limitation of liability)
VI-2(B) (force majeure provision)
VI-3(C) (synchronization)
VI-3(E) (compensation for intraLATA toll calls)
VI-3(F) (intraLATA toll free service)
VI-3(G) (700 number test lines)
VI-3(H) (notification of long distance carrier)
VI-3(I) (fulfillment process)

**Issues For Which Verizon Virginia Has Essentially Accepted
WorldCom' s Language**

Assignments and Delegations

Issue IV-88

Responsibility for Costs and Expenses

Issue IV-95

Confidential Information

Issue IV-97

Sharing Confidential Information

Issue IV-98

Negotiations Prompted by Change in Laws

Issue IV-113

Submission of Agreements for Approval-Appeals

Issue IV-116

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)	
Petition of WorldCom, Inc. Pursuant)	
to Section 252(e)(5) of the)	
Communications Act for Expedited)	
Preemption of the Jurisdiction of the)	CC Docket No. 00-218
Virginia State Corporation Commission)	
Regarding Interconnection Disputes)	
with Verizon Virginia Inc., and for)	
Expedited Arbitration)	
)	
In the Matter of)	
Petition of Cox Virginia Telecom, Inc.)	
Pursuant to Section 252(e)(5) of the)	
Communications Act for Preemption)	CC Docket No. 00-249
of the Jurisdiction of the Virginia State)	
Corporation Commission Regarding)	
Interconnection Disputes with Verizon)	
Virginia Inc. and for Arbitration)	
)	
In the Matter of)	
Petition of AT&T Communications of)	
Virginia Inc., Pursuant to Section 252(e)(5))	CC Docket No. 00-251
of the Communications Act for Preemption)	
of the Jurisdiction of the Virginia)	
Corporation Commission Regarding)	
Interconnection Disputes With Verizon)	
Virginia Inc.)	

**OBJECTIONS OF WORLDCOM TO
VERIZON VIRGINIA INC.'S THIRD SET
OF DISCOVERY TO WORLDCOM**

WorldCom, Inc. respectfully submits its objections to Verizon Virginia, Inc.'s Third Set of Discovery.

**OBJECTIONS TO REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION 1-17,
INTERROGATORIES 1-45, AND DOCUMENT REQUESTS 1-3**

WorldCom objects to these requests in their entirety. With respect to the Requests for Admission, the issues presented are not properly resolved through that discovery tool. Requests for Admission are properly used to obtain agreement on uncontroversial factual matters so that neither party must unnecessarily waste resources establishing such facts. The Requests for Admission set forth in Verizon's Third Set of Discovery does not seek admissions regarding such factual matters, but instead asks WorldCom to concede that Verizon's positions with respect to various issues is correct. WorldCom obviously will not so concede. More importantly, however, per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony supporting WorldCom's positions and opposing Verizon's position shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. The evidence will include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) Per the Commission's March 27, 2001 letter, WorldCom will provide its direct case in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001. Verizon's attempt to have WorldCom submit what is the functional equivalent of testimony in the guise of Requests for Admission is procedurally inappropriate, vexatious and harassing.

Verizon's Interrogatories suffer from the same flaw. The interrogatories direct WorldCom to provide substantive commentary on Verizon's proposal, and to explain why WorldCom's proposals are superior to Verizon's. Such information is appropriately provided through the testimony process set up by the Commission; that careful process should not be circumvented through discovery requests. The interrogatories are also overly broad and not designed to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Moreover, many of the interrogatories seek information that is not relevant to the issues presented. For example, Verizon frequently asks WorldCom to provide it with the number of customers served in a particular manner. The response to such an interrogatory has no bearing on WorldCom's legal entitlement to the service or element at issue.

Verizon's document requests seek, *inter alia*, all documents relied upon in answering the interrogatories. Because the interrogatories are inappropriate the document request is as well. The other two requests are overbroad, and seek information that is not relevant to the issues presented and not designed to lead to the discovery of any admissible evidence.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa B. Smith
Kecia Boney Lewis
WorldCom, Inc.
1133 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Allen Freifeld
Kimberly Wild
WorldCom, Inc.
1133 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Jodie L. Kelley
Robin M. Meriweather
Marc E. Isserles
Jenner & Block LLC
601 Thirteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I do hereby certify that true and accurate copies of the foregoing "Objections of WorldCom to Verizon Virginia Inc.'s Third Set of Discovery to WorldCom" were delivered this 5th day of July, 2001 in the manner indicated below. Copies were also served electronically on each parties' designated representatives.

Karen Zacharia
David Hall
Verizon-Virginia, Inc.
1320 North Courthouse Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201
** By Federal Express*

Richard D. Gary
Kelly L. Faglioni
Hunton & Williams
Riverfront Plaza, East Tower
951 East Byrd Street
Richmond, VA 23219-4074
** By Federal Express*

Catherine Kane Ronis
Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, LLP
2445 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037-1420
**By Hand Delivery*

Lydia Pulley
600 East Main Street
11th Floor
Richmond, VA 23219
** By Federal Express*

Mark Keffer
AT&T Corporation
3033 Chain Bridge Road
Oakton, Virginia 22185
** By Regular Mail*

J.G. Harrington
Dow, Lohnes & Albertson
1200 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036
** By Regular Mail*

By: _____
Jodie L. Kelley

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)	
Petition of WorldCom, Inc. Pursuant)	
to Section 252(e)(5) of the)	
Communications Act for Expedited)	
Preemption of the Jurisdiction of the)	CC Docket No. 00-218
Virginia State Corporation Commission)	
Regarding Interconnection Disputes)	
with Verizon Virginia Inc., and for)	
Expedited Arbitration)	
)	
In the Matter of)	
Petition of Cox Virginia Telecom, Inc.)	
Pursuant to Section 252(e)(5) of the)	
Communications Act for Preemption)	CC Docket No. 00-249
of the Jurisdiction of the Virginia State)	
Corporation Commission Regarding)	
Interconnection Disputes with Verizon)	
Virginia Inc. and for Arbitration)	
)	
In the Matter of)	
Petition of AT&T Communications of)	
Virginia Inc., Pursuant to Section 252(e)(5))	CC Docket No. 00-251
of the Communications Act for Preemption)	
of the Jurisdiction of the Virginia)	
Corporation Commission Regarding)	
Interconnection Disputes With Verizon)	
Virginia Inc.)	

**RESPONSES OF WORLDCOM, INC. TO
VERIZON VIRGINIA INC.'S FIRST SET
OF DATA REQUESTS**

CC Docket No. 00-218

Verizon Set #1

July 2, 2001

Q1. With regard to Issue III-16, do you agree that Verizon Virginia's language in § 6 of the Additional Services Attachment to Verizon Virginia's proposed interconnection agreement adequately and lawfully addresses the issue of referral announcements? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's proposed language is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue.

RESPONSE: This issue has been resolved by the parties.

CC Docket No. 00-218
Verizon Set #1
July 2, 2001

Q2. With regard to Issue IV-47, do you agree that Verizon Virginia's language in §§ 10, 32.1 and 32.2 of Verizon Virginia's proposed interconnection agreement adequately and lawfully addresses the issue of the Parties' contact with each other's subscribers? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's proposed language is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including issue IV-47 of the parties' contact with each other's subscribers, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001. Subject to and without waiving the above response, the contract provisions dealing with contact with subscribers must clarify the term subscriber, state that each party is the primary contact for its own subscribers and set forth procedures for a party to handle inquiries that it may get from the other party's subscribers. Refer to WorldCom's Proposed Interconnection Agreement, Attachment VIII, Sections 1.1.1.1 through 1.1.1.3.

CC Docket No. 00-218
Verizon Set #1
July 2, 2001

Q3. With regard to Issue IV-56, do you agree that Verizon Virginia is not legally obligated to participate in the National Consumers Telecommunications Data Exchange? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason why.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including issue IV-56, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001. Subject to and without waiving the above response, WorldCom does not agree with Verizon's assertion and believes the FCC has, in the past, compelled membership in industry associations. Further, Verizon needs to provide competitors with information on the credit worthiness of telephone subscribers. Because Verizon is the only local provider they are the only ones in a position to provide this information. Payment information can be provided in the CSR. Finally, Verizon has agreed in New York to participate in the National consumers Telecommunications Data Exchange.

CC Docket No. 00-218
Verizon Set #1
July 2, 2001

Q4. With regard to Issue IV-59, do you agree that WorldCom has access to relevant USOCs and FIDs for Verizon Virginia's "legacy" systems via Verizon Virginia's website and that USOCs for expressTRAK will be available on the website in July 2001? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason why.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including the issue IV-59, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001. Subject to the above statement, WorldCom is reviewing USOCs and FIDs that Verizon recently provided to determine if they are readable/usable. However, this does not alleviate the need for a contractual obligation on this issue. Further, WorldCom cannot speculate as to whether USOCs for expressTRAK will be available on the Verizon website in July 2001.

CC Docket No. 00-218

Verizon Set #1

July 2, 2001

Q5. With regard to Issue IV-64, do you agree that Verizon Virginia's agreement to accept requests for expedited intervals, provided that interval is reasonable from an operational perspective and the customer is willing to pay the costs associated with an expedited interval, adequately and lawfully addresses the issue of expedited service? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's agreement is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including issue IV-64, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001. Subject to and without waiving the above response, Verizon's statement in the question does not alleviate the need for a contractual obligation regarding this issue.

CC Docket No. 00-218
Verizon Set #1
July 2, 2001

Q6. With regard to Issue IV-74, do you agree that the processes of interim, standard and collocation billing are adequately and lawfully addressed in Verizon Virginia's Customer Support website? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's Customer Support website is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue. Further, please explain in detail why any modifications to the processes of interim, standard and collocation billing should not be handled through the industry collaborative change management process.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including issue IV-74, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001. Subject to and without waiving the above response, Verizon's processes of interim, standard and collocation billing must be memorialized in the interconnection agreement in addition to being present on the website.

CC Docket No. 00-218

Verizon Set #1

July 2, 2001

Q7. With regard to Issue IV-79, do you agree that the 911/E911 Attachment to the Verizon Virginia Model Interconnection Agreement (see Exhibit C-1 to Verizon Virginia's Answer) adequately and lawfully addresses the 911/E911 requirements? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's proposed language is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including issue IV-79, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001.

CC Docket No. 00-218

Verizon Set #1

July 2, 2001

Q8. With regard to Issues IV-80 and 81, do you agree that §3 of the Additional Services Attachment to the Verizon Virginia Model Interconnection Agreement (see Exhibit C-1 to Verizon Virginia's Answer) adequately and lawfully addresses Directory Assistance and Operator Services? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's proposed language is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including issue IV-80 and IV-81, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001. Subject to and without waiving the above response, Verizon should be required to provide Operator Services and Directory Assistance as UNEs until such time as Verizon can demonstrate that it provides customized routing per FCC rules.

CC Docket No. 00-218

Verizon Set #1

July 2, 2001

Q9. With regard to Issue IV-82, do you agree that §4 of the Additional Services Attachment to the Verizon Virginia Model Interconnection Agreement (see Exhibit C-1 to Verizon Virginia's Answer) adequately and lawfully addresses Directory Assistance and Listing Service Requests? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's proposed language is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including issue IV-82, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001. Subject to and without waiving the above response, this issue has been resolved through agreed to modifications to Verizon's Section 4, subject to reviewing the limitation of liability and indemnification portions.

CC Docket No. 00-218
Verizon Set #1
July 2, 2001

Q10. With regard to Issue I-10, do you agree that §22 of the agreement proposed by Verizon Virginia for interconnection with AT&T (see Exhibit C-3 to Verizon Virginia's Answer) adequately and lawfully addresses the issue of termination? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's proposed language is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including issue I-10, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001. Subject to and without waiving the above response, WorldCom requires termination language to prevent Verizon from terminating the agreement without Commission oversight. WorldCom has proposed reasonable language that allows Verizon to invoke Commission jurisdiction when necessary.

CC Docket No. 00-218

Verizon Set #1

July 2, 2001

Q11. With regard to Issues III-15 and IV-107, do you agree that §28.16 of the agreement proposed by Verizon Virginia for interconnection with AT&T (see Exhibit C-3 to Verizon Virginia's Answer) adequately and lawfully addresses the issue of intellectual property? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's proposed language is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including issues III-15 and IV-107, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001.

CC Docket No. 00-218
Verizon Set #1
July 2, 2001

Q12. With regard to Issue IV-45, do you agree that §17 of the General Terms and Conditions of the Verizon Virginia Model Interconnection Agreement (see Exhibit C-1 to Verizon Virginia's Answer) adequately and lawfully addresses the issue of fraud protection? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's proposed language is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including issue IV-45, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001.

CC Docket No. 00-218
Verizon Set #1
July 2, 2001

Q13. With regard to Issue IV-88, do you agree to the modifications to Part A, §3.1 proposed by Verizon Virginia (see Response to Issue IV-88, Exhibit B to Verizon Virginia's Answer)? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's proposed language is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue.

- a) If you do not agree to the modifications to Part A, §3.1 proposed by Verizon Virginia, do you agree that §28.8 of the agreement proposed by Verizon Virginia for interconnection with AT&T (see Exhibit C-3 to Verizon Virginia's Answer) adequately and lawfully addresses assignment and delegation? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's proposed language is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including issue IV-88, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001.

Subject to and without waiving the above, response, WorldCom believes that Verizon's changes impose a significant and unnecessary burden on the parties to seek and obtain prior written consent even in situations where one of the parties is merely carrying out an internal corporate restructuring. These types of restructurings can occur for any number of benign reasons (e.g., tax considerations or corporate consolidation). The Act does not give Verizon the right to so tightly restrict the other parties right to freely assign. For example, during the life of the first generation interconnection agreements MCI WorldCom under went an internal corporate restructuring that involved one of its local service providers (CLEC). All that was required and all that Verizon needed was notice of the fact that the restructuring had occurred and the resulting name changes. Verizon never once complained or took issue with that restructuring. The same has been true reciprocally of Verizon's restructurings. It appears that the Verizon/AT&T language suffers the same defect. In fact, it is more burdensome because it

requires the assigning party to make a showing that the assignee has a certain level of financial and other resources.

CC Docket No. 00-218
Verizon Set #1
July 2, 2001

Q39. With regard to Issue IV-91, do you agree that §§ 12.3 and 18.2 of the Verizon Virginia-proposed interconnection agreement with AT&T (see Response to Issue IV-91, Exhibit B to Verizon Virginia's Answer and Exhibit C-3 to Verizon Virginia's Answer) adequately and lawfully address the issue of branding? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's proposed language is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including issue IV-91, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001.

CC Docket No. 00-218
Verizon Set #1
July 2, 2001

Q40. With regard to Issue IV-93, do you agree that § 12.10.3 of the Verizon Virginia-proposed interconnection agreement with AT&T (Exhibit C-3 to Verizon Virginia's Answer) adequately and lawfully addresses the actions of Verizon Virginia employees while on the premises of a WorldCom customer? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's proposed language is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including issue IV-93, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001. Subject to and without waiving the above response, WorldCom requires language that insures that Verizon will not disparage WorldCom or its products and services to WorldCom's customers. In addition, the language must ensure that Verizon does not utilize visits to WorldCom customers as marketing/win back opportunities.

CC Docket No. 00-218
Verizon Set #1
July 2, 2001

Q41. With regard to Issue IV-94, do you agree to the modifications to Part A, §8.1 proposed by Verizon Virginia (see Response to Issue IV-94, Exhibit B to Verizon Virginia's Answer)? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's proposed language is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including issue IV-94, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001. Subject to and without waiving the above response, Verizon has not proposed any changes. Verizon simply stated that it wanted modifications that "make clear that the rates in the pricing attachment will change if the Commission or VSCC approve, order or allow rates to go into effect." Altering the prices in the contract based on rates that have simply gone "into effect" is unacceptable. It allows Verizon to unilaterally undercut the rates arbitrated in this proceeding and ordered by the FCC.

CC Docket No. 00-218
Verizon Set #1
July 2, 2001

Q42. With regard to Issue IV-95, do you agree to the modifications to Part A, §8.2 proposed by Verizon Virginia (see Response to Issue IV-95, Exhibit B to Verizon Virginia's Answer)? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's proposed language is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including issue IV-95, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001. Subject to and without waiving the above, response, WorldCom does not understand Verizon's concern and Verizon's modification introduces ambiguity into the contract. Verizon does an inadequate job of explaining its concern with respect to Issue IV-95. Further, Verizon's modification only confuses the application of the change in law provisions.

Q43. With regard to Issue IV-97, do you agree to the modifications to Part A, §10 proposed by Verizon Virginia (see Response to Issue IV-97, Exhibit B to Verizon Virginia's Answer)? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's proposed language is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue.

- a) If you do not agree to the modifications to Part A, §10 proposed by Verizon Virginia, do you agree that §§18.3 – 18.5 of the agreement proposed by Verizon Virginia for interconnection with AT&T (see Exhibit C-3 to Verizon Virginia's Answer) adequately and lawfully addresses the issue of CPNI? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's proposed language is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including issue IV-97, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001. Subject to and without waiving the above response, Verizon's proposed changes would add two sections to the Confidentiality provisions that Verizon is otherwise agreeable to. The first section would permit Verizon to audit CPNI. WorldCom has already agreed -- in settling Issue IV-89 -- to include a provision in the audit provisions that allows each party to audit the other party's use and access to CPNI. Another provision doing the same thing would be redundant. Moreover, the second section would permit Verizon to monitor on a continuous basis WorldCom's use and access to CPNI. Such monitoring would allow for abuse by Verizon and serves no countervailing purpose. It appears that the Verizon and AT&T contract language suffers from the same defect. It contains a provision that allows Verizon to monitor AT&T's use and access to CPNI. Section 18.4 and 18.5, dealing with "Cooperation with Law Enforcement" and "Resolution of Annoyance/Harassing Calls" have nothing to do with CPNI and appear to be an incorrect cite by Verizon in its discovery request.

CC Docket No. 00-218

Verizon Set #1

July 2, 2001

Q44. With regard to Issue IV-98, do you agree to the modifications to Part A, §10.3.3 and Attachment VIII, §1.1.1.4 proposed by Verizon Virginia (see Response to Issue IV-98, Exhibit B to Verizon Virginia's Answer)? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's proposed language is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including issue IV-98, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001. Subject to and without waiving the above, response, WorldCom is not aware of any Applicable Law that permits Verizon to share the information it gathers or has access to in its wholesale operations with CLECs with its retail operations. Any such shared access or sharing of information between wholesale and retail operations is anti-competitive and not in the public interest.

CC Docket No. 00-218
Verizon Set #1
July 2, 2001

Q45. With regard to Issues IV-100 and 101, do you agree that §28.11 of the agreement proposed by Verizon Virginia for interconnection with AT&T (see Exhibit C-3 to Verizon Virginia's Answer) provides an adequate and lawful dispute resolution mechanism? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's proposed language is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including issue IV-100 and IV-101, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001.

CC Docket No. 00-218

Verizon Set #1

July 2, 2001

Q46. With regard to Issue IV-106, do you agree that §24 of the agreement proposed by Verizon Virginia for interconnection with AT&T (see Exhibit C-3 to Verizon Virginia's Answer) provides an adequate and lawful indemnification mechanism? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's proposed language is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including issue IV-106, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001. Subject to and without waiving the above response, indemnification should be required from each party for third party claims brought against the other party, for which the first party was responsible. That is, if WorldCom is sued for something that Verizon caused, Verizon should indemnify WorldCom. Otherwise, WorldCom becomes financially responsible for things outside of WorldCom's control – that is, Verizon actions and omissions.

CC Docket No. 00-218
Verizon Set #1
July 2, 2001

Q47. With regard to Issue IV-110, do you agree that §§18.1 – 18.3 of the agreement proposed by Verizon Virginia for interconnection with AT&T (see Exhibit C-3 to Verizon Virginia's Answer) adequately and lawfully addresses the issue of migration of service? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's proposed language is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including issue IV-110, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001.

CC Docket No. 00-218
Verizon Set #1
July 2, 2001

Q48. With regard to Issue IV-113, do you agree to the modifications to §25.2 and 25.8 proposed by Verizon Virginia (see Response to Issue IV-113, Exhibit B to Verizon Virginia's Answer)? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's proposed language is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including issue IV-113, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001. Subject to and without waiving the above response, WorldCom notes that Section 25.8 proposed by Verizon does not include a reciprocity provision if the change of law benefits WorldCom and also that a 30-day transition seems relatively short.

CC Docket No. 00-218

Verizon Set #1

July 2, 2001

Q49. With regard to Issue IV-116, do you agree to the modifications to §25.6 proposed by Verizon Virginia (see Response to Issue IV-116, Exhibit B to Verizon Virginia's Answer)? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's proposed language is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including issue IV-116, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001. Subject to and without waiving the above response, WorldCom notes that Verizon's added language regarding a stay of the agreement appears to be extreme – i.e. if the agreement is stayed (not in effect) during the lengthy appeals process, WorldCom's business plans could be on hold indefinitely.

CC Docket No. 00-218
Verizon Set #1
July 2, 2001

Q50. With regard to Issue IV-121, do you agree that §31 of the General Terms and Conditions of Verizon Virginia Model Interconnection Agreement (see Exhibit C-1 to Verizon Virginia's Answer) adequately and lawfully addresses the remedies issue? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's proposed language is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including issue IV-121, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001. Subject to and without waiving the above response, language incorporating performance standards, metrics and self-executing remedies should be included in the interconnection agreement.

CC Docket No. 00-218

Verizon Set #1

July 2, 2001

Q51. With regard to Issue IV-126, do you agree that § 28.7 of the agreement proposed by Verizon Virginia for interconnection with AT&T (see Exhibit C-3 to Verizon Virginia's Answer) adequately and lawfully addresses the collection and payment of taxes? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail every reason that Verizon Virginia's proposed language is unlawful or otherwise fails to address adequately this issue.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including issue IV-126, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001.

CC Docket No. 00-218

Verizon Set #1

July 2, 2001

Q52. With regard to Issue IV-129, do you agree that the Glossary in Verizon Virginia Model Interconnection Agreement (see Exhibit C-1 to Verizon Virginia's Answer) provides adequate and lawful definitions? If your response is anything other than an unconditional "yes," please explain in detail which of Verizon Virginia's proposed definitions are unlawful or otherwise inadequate.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, direct testimony shall be filed and served in the "form of affidavits," with supporting documentation, expert reports and exhibits. In addition, the evidence shall be organized on an issue-by-issue basis and shall include "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by the expert, the basis and reasons for each opinion and all data or information considered by the witness in forming those opinions." (FCC Public Notice at p. 7) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Direct Testimony, as described above, is due from the parties on July 19, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its direct case, including issue IV-129, in its Direct Testimony to be filed on July 19, 2001. Subject to and without waiving the above response, WorldCom does not generally agree with the definitions in Verizon's Glossary. Verizon's Glossary contains definitions that reflect its positions on numerous unresolved issues before the FCC. For example, Verizon's definition of Interconnection Point reflects a portion of its unreasonable and unlawful GRIPS proposal.

CC Docket No. 00-218
Verizon Set #1
July 2, 2001

Q53. Please identify all costs and rates you intend to propose on July 2, 2001 in this proceeding.

RESPONSE: This question is premature. Per the FCC's February 1, 2001 Public Notice establishing procedures for arbitration of interconnection agreements between Verizon and WorldCom, copies of all cost models, cost studies and other studies as well as any underlying documentation must be provided to the parties. (FCC Public Notice at p. 3) On March 27, 2001, Dorothy Atwood, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, issued a letter that included a procedural schedule for the Verizon/WorldCom arbitration before the FCC. Per this schedule, Cost Studies, as described above, are due from the parties on July 2, 2001. Per the FCC's procedural schedule, WorldCom will provide its cost studies and underlying documentation in its July 2, 2001 filing.

CC Docket No. 00-218

Verizon Set #1

July 2, 2001

Q54. Please identify all cost studies and cost models, including the model version, you intend to submit in this proceeding.

RESPONSE: See response to Q53.

CC Docket No. 00-218
Verizon Set #1
July 2, 2001

Q55. Please identify the depreciation lives you intend to submit in this proceeding.

RESPONSE: See response to Q53.

CC Docket No. 00-218
Verizon Set #1
July 2, 2001

DOCUMENT REQUEST

1. Please produce all documents referred to or relied upon in answering the above interrogatories.

Response: No documents were relied upon in answering the above interrogatories.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa B. Smith
Jodie L. Kelley
Kecia Boney Lewis
Robin M. Meriweather
WorldCom, Inc.
Marc E. Isserles
1133 19th Street, N.W.
Jenner & Block, LLC
Washington, D.C. 20036
601 13th Street, NW, 1200S

Washington, DC 20005

Allen Freifeld
Kimberly Wild
WorldCom, Inc.
1133 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I do hereby certify that true and accurate copies of the foregoing "Responses of WorldCom, Inc. to Verizon Virginia Inc.'s First Set of Data Requests" were delivered this 2nd day of July, 2001, by federal express and regular mail to:

Karen Zacharia
David Hall
Verizon-Virginia, Inc.
1320 North Courthouse Road,
8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201
** By Federal Express*

Richard D. Gary
Kelly L. Faglioni
Hunton & Williams
Riverfront Plaza, East Tower
951 East Byrd Street
Richmond, VA 23219-4074
** By Federal Express*

Catherine Kane Ronis
Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, LLP
2445 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037-1420
**By Hand Delivery*

Lydia Pulley
600 East Main Street
11th Floor
Richmond, VA 23219
** By Federal Express*

Mark Keffer
AT&T Corporation
3033 Chain Bridge Road

Oakton, Virginia 22185
* *By Regular Mail*

J.G. Harrington
Dow, Lohnes & Albertson
1200 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036
* *By Regular Mail*

By: _____
Jodie L. Kelley